DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 325 569 UD 027 705

TITLE	Pathways to Success for America's Youth and Young Families. Citizenship through Service.
INSTITUTION	William T. Grant Foundation, Washington, DC. Commission on Work, Family, and Citizenship.
PUB DATE	Nov 88
NOTE	17p.; Excerpts from "The Forgotten Half: Pathways to Success for America's Youth and Young Families." Final report of the William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family, and Citizenship. Washington, D.C., November, 1988.
AVAILABLE FROM	Youth and America's Future, Suite 301, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20036-5541.
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Citizen Participation; *Citizenship Education; *Citizenship Responsibility; Elementary Secondary Education; Individual Development; *Public Service; *Social Responsibility; *Student Participation; Student Responsibility; *Student Volunteers; Young Adults; Youth; Youth Agencies; Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Community Service

ABSTRACT

This report focuses on youth service as a vital component of education for citizenship. The following six major recommendations to encourage voluntary student and youth services are offered: (1) creation of quality student service opportunities as central to the fundamental educational program of every public school, including either elective credit or graduation requirement service, and age-appropriate curricula and instruction from kindergarten through twelfth grade; (2) state-level encouragement of local school jurisdiction efforts to enlist the young in serving their communities, including the provision of sufficient financial and technical assistance to ensure high quality programs; (3) financial support from business, local foundations, city and state resources, and organizations whose constituents are served by youth, to ensure the availability to young people of the maturing effects of service to others and the use of diverse methods to achieve this goal; (4) unification of youth service organizations into a nationwide service federation; (5) support for federal financial assistance to launch youth service programs, with emphasis on meeting state and local needs; and (6) revitalization of existing national service programs and serious consideration of a National Youth Conservation Corps. (AF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED325569

CITIZENSHIP THROUGH SERVICE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Shelly Jones
William T. Grant Foundation

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

YOUTH AND AMERICA'S FUTURE:

THE WILLIAM T. GRANT FOUNDATION COMMISSION ON WORK, FAMILY AND CITIZENSHIP

When William Thomas Grant established the Grant Foundation in 1936, he sought a better understanding of the ways in which individuals adapt to the vicissitudes of life. Touched in his professional life by the importance of caring human relationships, Mr. Grant wished to "help children develop what is in them" so they would better "enjoy all the good things the world has to offer them."

Fifty years later, recognizing the special needs of older adolescents in a changing society, the Foundation's Trustees established **Youth and America's Future** with much the same purpose; its charge is not to engage in new research but to evaluate current knowledge, stimulate new ideas, increase communication among researchers, practitioners, and policymakers and, thus, help our nation chart a better future for youth.

The Foundation's President, Robert J. Haggerty, M.D., has described the Commission's unique perspective:

"Against a rising chorus of legitimate concern about the many problems facing today's youth, the Foundation has initiated this Commission on Youth and America's Future to speak in a different voice. It will explore the strengths of America's young men and women, their families, and the programs and community institutions that serve them. We adopt this approach not to diminish the importance of the problems that exist, but to learn the lessons of success. The Foundation is confident that this effort to look with renewed respect at youth, where they stride as well as where they stumble, will help forge the links of understanding and mutual responsibility that make our democracy strong."

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Harold Howe II, Chairperson
Senior Lecturer, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA

Bytlye Y. Avery
Executive Director, National Black Women's Health Project, Atlanta, GA

Mary Jo Bane
Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA

Lewis H. Butler
President, California Tommorrow, San Francisco, CA

Fletcher L. Byrom
Chairman and CEO (Retired), Koppers Company, Carefree, AZ

Hillary Rodham Clinton
The Governor's Mansion, Partner, The Rose Law Firm, Little Rock, AR

Barbara J. Easterling
Executive Vice President, Communications Workers of America, Washington, DC

Josue M. Gonzalez
President of the Board, Latino Institute; Director, Bureau of Resource Development, Chicago Public Schools, Chicago, IL

Albert H. Hastorf
Professor of Psychology, Stanford University, Stanford, CA

Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C.
President (Emeritus), University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN

David W. Hornbeck
Former Maryland State Superintendent of Schools, Baltimore, MD

Douglas X. Patiño
President and CEO, Marin Community Foundation, Larkspur, CA

Michael V. Reagen
Director, Missouri Department of Social Services, Jefferson City, MO

Henry W. Riecken
Professor of Behavioral Sciences, (Emeritus), School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA

Kenneth S. Rolland
Managing Director, Chemical Bank, New York, NY

Bernard C. Watson
President and CEO, William Penn Foundation, Philadelphia, PA

William Julius Wilson
Professor of Sociology and Public Policy University of Chicago, Chicago, IL

Daniel Yankelovich
Chairman, Daniel Yankelovich Group, New York, NY

Robert J. Haggerty, M.D. (ex-officio)
President, William T. Grant Foundation, New York, NY

COMMISSION STAFF

Samuel Halperin
Study Director

Atelia Melaville
Research Associate

Lynda Tredway
Research Associate

Arlette Taylor
Executive Assistant

Commission Office: 1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 301, Washington, DC 20036-5541

> *Early in life we need to learn that volunteering is crucial in a democracy. The challenge is to balance one's own needs with a genuine responsiveness to others.*
>
> — **Most Reverend Joseph M. Sullivan, Chairman of the Board of Directors, City Volunteer Corps, New York**

Chapter 4

Pathways to Success: Citizenship through Service

Service as a Two-Way Street

The tradition in American schools—as though there was an official script—calls for students to memorize key passages from the great documents of American government and history. Their mastery of stirring and important material, such as the Preamble to the Constitution, is presumed to bond them to their country and its ideals. The study of US history and government is supposed to produce adults who value democratic traditions and shoulder responsibilities with their fellow citizens.

But the script does not always unfold that way. By one important measure—voter participation—it needs radical rewriting. Only 53.1 percent of eligible voters cared enough to vote in the 1984 presidential election, and voter turnouts decrease with level of earnings. While 76 percent of the people earning over $50,000 per year voted in 1984, only 38 percent of those earning $5,000 or less do so.[1]

Although the Commission reaffirms the obvious importance of learning the concepts and facts of American history and government, we strongly believe that *knowledge must be integrated with action in order to produce the desired outcome: a citizen participating fully in the responsibilities of community, state, and nation.*

That people need to help and care for one another is an idea as old as the first human communities and equally valid for a modern mass society. But too many Americans, especially the young, feel a debilitating sense of powerlessness in the face of large national and world issues that affect their lives but elude their control. The Commission believes this sense of futility, and the consequent preoccupation with self, can be redirected into an ethic of service and commitment to others.[2] When young people have a chance to act on their humanitarian ideals, they build self-respect and strong attachments to family and community. *There is virtually no limit to what young people—with appropriate education, training, and encouragement—can do, no social need they cannot help meet.* We reiterate: *Young people are essential resources, and society needs their active participation as citizens.*

Every community's voluntary sector offers young people varied opportunities to work on their own or with adults to promote social good. By engaging young people in the real challenges of community life, rather than isolating them from adult concerns, much needed work gets done with both youth and the society the better for it.[4]

If all young people—whether college-bound or members of the Forgotten Half—had opportunities to render needed service, they would come to understand that life is a process of both giving and getting. They would better appreciate that democracy involves a social compact in which society nurtures and cares for its young, and the young, in turn, care for the weak, the needy, the infirm, as well as the healthy and empowered members of society. They would

This chapter is excerpted from *The Forgotten Half: Pathways to Success for America's Youth and Young Families*. Washington, DC: Youth and America's Future: The William T. Grant Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship, November 1988. See page 90 for ordering instructions.

become contributors, problem-solvers, and partners with adults in improving their communities and the larger society.[5] If the service commitment begins early enough and continues into adulthood, participatory citizenship would become what Robert Bellah and his colleagues call "habits of the heart," family and community traditions of local political participation that sustain a person, a community, and a nation.[6]

> *Generosity of spirit is thus the ability to acknowledge an interconnectedness—one's debts to society—that binds one to others whether one wants to accept it or not. It is also the ability to engage in the caring that nurtures that interconnectedness. It is a virtue that everyone should strive for . . . a conception of citizenship that is still alive in America.*
>
> — Robert Bellah et al., *Habits of the Heart*[5]

Documentary evidence supports the value of service in young people's lives. According to one longitudinal study, graduates of experimental schools established in the 1930s that featured problem-solving curricula, extensive community learning opportunities, peer teaching, and student-faculty control over governance were more successful in life than students from schools that provided only limited opportunities of these types.[7] A tracking of 79 high school students who performed semester-long internships in four New York county governments reaffirmed the virtues of a community-based rather than a solely school-grounded approach to learning about the processes of government.[8] Similar outcomes emerge from a broad range of hands-on service and volunteer activities by young people throughout the nation.

Yet, reports from the 1980s are uneven. From the 1,103 respondents among 5,000 high schools surveyed by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching comes the heartening news that 70 percent had some form of student service program.[9] The nature and quality of those programs is, however, unknown, as is the state of service in the four-fifths of non-responding schools.

The same Carnegie study reported that only 20 percent or fewer of the students in those service-oriented high schools actually participated in the available service projects. According to the oft-quoted annual survey of a large sample of incoming college freshmen of the 1986-87 school year (209,627 students at 390 higher education institutions) by the American Council on Education and the University of California at Los Angeles, only 39 percent, as compared to 83 percent in 1967, held that "developing a meaningful philosophy of life" was a major goal.[10] Nevertheless, in 1985, nearly 70 percent claimed to have performed volunteer service during the previous year. In 1985, too, a Gallup survey reported that 43 percent of the 18-24-year age group had actually done volunteer work that year.[11] Of course, the same person driven by a desire "to be well-off financially" (the ACE-UCLA poll put that total at 76 percent for the 1986 freshmen) could have an equally strong wish "to help the community." Or, perhaps, self-reporting of service performed could simply be a pitch to college admissions officers to look favorably on a well-rounded high school senior's application.

Kim Grose, a Stanford University sophomore active in campus-based service, cautions against drawing hasty conclusions about today's young people from any survey data cited or by reference to the tumultuous decade of the '60s:

> *Comparisons drawn between the student activism of the 1960s and the 1980s is often misleading because it gets caught up in '60s stereotypes and jargon and misses the true nature of*

volunteerism on campuses today. At my university, a school often looked upon as an elitist, career-oriented institution, public service is one of the strongest extra-curricular activities. Today's politically and socially active students are not only "hippie-throwbacks" or radicals; many are the same students who plan careers in engineering or business. They do not consider themselves crusaders and do not plan to spend their lives "changing the world." Students tutor, coach softball, paint playgrounds, and read to the elderly because they are interested in people, or because they want to learn a little about poverty and racism before they head out into the waiting corporate world. Or else they volunteer because they see their friends doing it, and it turns out to be fun.

Most students are very idealistic, and some wish to use their youthful energy to get involved in a poor community. Most have listened to their university president's speeches and feel some sense of obligation to repay society for the incredible opportunities open to them. Some will turn to politics, community organizing, or the Peace Corps after graduation as a way to help make the world a more just place. Many others have such enormous loan debts from high tuition costs that their career goals are aimed at law firms and investment banking firms, to satisfy their parents and creditors, not their own ideals.

None of us, no matter where our career paths take us, will ever forget the lessons we learned through volunteering in the community. We do not volunteer "to make a statement," or to use the people we work with to protest something. We try to see the homeless man, the hungry child, and the dying woman as the people they are, not the means to some political end.[12]

Whatever the motivation, opportunities for service beckon. The Commission believes strongly that closing the gap between rhetoric and performance would greatly benefit young people and communities alike.

The Benefits of Service

Educator Jane Kendall cites a prime benefit of service—more effective learning. She cautions, however, that *the best learning occurs when the initial, concrete service experience is followed by a period of disciplined reflection on the experience.* Time for talking, writing, and thinking about what they have done and seen allows the servers to assimilate and synthesize the experience, and later to test what they have learned in new situations. Reflection amplifies not only the service experience, but also the education and work experiences in the server's life.[13]

For the young person who engages in community service, the experience, if reinforced and rewarded, can be beneficial in several ways:

- It expands personal learning and social horizons far beyond home and classroom;
- It eases the often painful passage from school to work;
- It imparts a greater sense of the individual's personal worth and capabilities for leadership and problem-solving;

> *The youth population has been misnamed the self-centered generation. There's a strong desire to serve others. The problem we face in America today is not a lack of willingness to serve or help others but to find the appropriate outlet for this.*
>
> — George Gallup (1987)

- It bonds young people more securely and usefully to their communities and activates their civic knowledge in tangible ways;
- It creates genuine work and useful products of which youth and the community can be proud; and
- It teaches basic life skills needed for generic employability and enhances critical thinking skills.

These are significant benefits. But they resist easy categorization and quantification beyond the obvious generality that they all have to do with learning and personal development.

Service-learning offers a partial key to unlock the door that leads from school to work. Lauren Resnick of the Center for the Study of Learning at the University of Pittsburgh points out that students in school are judged by what they do individually. Outside of school, however, work is more often a collaborative enterprise and requires a person to mesh several talents and skills.[14] The experience of a group service project provides important job-readiness skills for the contemporary work world. According to Sue Berryman, Director of the National Center on Education and Employment at Teachers College, Columbia University, the restructuring of many jobs in today's market compels workers to see a project as a whole, find creative solutions to problems, and work cooperatively with others—qualities that also accompany service-learning, but not necessarily traditional didactic schooling.[15]

The service ethic can be instilled incrementally with experiences appropriate to the developmental age of participants—voluntary activity in the community promotes adolescent development more broadly.[16] Fresh Force of Minneapolis, a junior high school service corps, is an example of an effort to respond to the characteristics of the 11-15-year-old age group. In all nine junior highs where it operates, students are organized to propose and implement community service projects. The Pillsbury Company funds recognition events and arranges media coverage for students who contribute 30+ service hours. The United Way pays for a city-wide coordinator, affiliated with the YMCA. As early as possible—especially by junior high school, when energetic young people can often learn better by doing than by sitting passively in classrooms—service and reflection on that service ought to be a part of the regular school curriculum. And every student can gain by participating.

Amplifying these observations, pediatrician Melvin Levine, Director of the Clinical Center for the Study of Development and Learning at the University of North Carolina, argues that schools constrict the ways in which our young people can demonstrate their abilities. At the very time when youth require varied opportunities to learn and to do, schools often confine them to demonstrations of academic, verbal, and specific memory skills that receive high profile in most schools. If the student is not successful in those restricted definitions of competence, he or she is labeled a failure.[17] *Learning through serving is one method of experiential learning that could be used well with students who learn best by doing and by working with others, rather than solely by reading and rote learning.*

Stephen Hamilton and L. Mickey Fenzel found that, for 44 youth in 12 projects, volunteer work had positive effects on their social attitudes, their sense of themselves, and the knowledge and skills they exercised in their voluntary activities.[18] In another study by Conrad and Hedin of 27 variations of experiential education programs, students showed significant increases in moral reasoning, self-esteem, and social and personal responsibility, as well as improved attitudes toward adults, more interest in career exploration, and better problem-solving skills.[19]

Individual or group service-learning projects bestow different benefits. One-to-one service experiences often encourage close relationships between adults and youth and foster intergenerational understanding. Group projects, on the other hand, are more complex because they entail planning and cooperating with others in the work group. The group experience itself can be a powerful learning experience for young people, who thereby try out the roles of leadership and followership.[20]

Growing efforts use service models with at-risk youth. If increased self-esteem and job preparedness are the fruits of service-learning, the reasoning seems to go, then who in our population could better use this leg up than at-risk youth? In Pittsburgh's Oasis program, 100 at-risk seventh graders are enrolled in an education/community service program with the hope that these youth will stay in school and gain self-esteem, as well as serve their communities. In Indianapolis' Dropouts in Touch, older teens encourage younger students to remain in school. Former dropouts who have completed employment training draw on their personal, often negative, experiences to persuade young people to complete high school. Youth on probation assist senior

citizens with maintenance and clean-up activities in the Fountain Square section of Indianapolis, and young adolescents provide companionship services to the elderly.

The Commission believes that care must be taken that service projects are not designed primarily as devices to "rehabilitate" at-risk youth. This misses much of the true value of service, particularly its citizenship dimension. And we worry that service opportunities directed primarily to at-risk youth will stigmatize both these youth and the service concept. With this note of caution, we applaud service for *all* young people as an essential building block of citizenship. Moreover, because many young people need to work part-time, service should be an integral part of the regular school curricula and the service programs of community-based organizations, not an appendage to their lives or "another course" tacked on to their regular load.

> *Everyone can be great because everyone can serve.*
>
> — Martin Luther King, Jr.

Youth service yields substantial economic benefits to the community: in-kind contributions of labor and talent, future social welfare costs saved, and young people prepared for stable work and family life. An estimated 3.5 million full-time volunteers could meet numerous societal needs[21]—among them, at a conservative estimate, 500,000 nonprofessional workers in schools, 275,000 caring for severely restricted elderly and handicapped individuals, 225,000 in energy, environmental protection, and urban and rural conservation, 165,000 for services to children, youth, and families, and 200,000 in public safety.[22]

Young people now contribute at least 250 million hours of service annually through state, federal, and local programs. Youth Service America estimates that the monetary value of high school students contributing 17 million hours of unpaid service annually is $59.5 million (at $3.50 per hour). The 192 million service hours donated by college students, at an hourly wage of $5, represent a $940 million contribution. Youth corps members perform the remaining 41 million service hours.[23]

In short, service-learning promotes:

- increased competence, self-confidence, and self-esteem;
- experiences among people of diverse backgrounds;
- chances to learn in a different way—from doing, not from being told;
- experiences in problem-solving;
- empathy for others and working cooperatively with others;
- assumption of the responsibilities and obligations of life as well as the enjoyment of its privileges; and
- tangible public benefits to the community.

Even so, community service still faces formidable barriers in becoming a "habit of the heart." Only strong backing from policymakers will overcome the most obvious barriers: (1) unresponsive regulations regarding liability insurance, (2) the troublesome matter of transportation to and from sites, (3) inflexible school schedules, (4) coordination with the students' part-time jobs and other responsibilities, and, most especially, (5) policymakers and educators who believe that service is "tangential," "a nice frill, not integral to sound education."

Good service programs do not just happen. Nor can service be "neatly wrapped and tied when so many hours have been donated, journals written, credit and/or grades given." The spark plug of a service program is the adult leader who motivates young people to go deeper—not merely to serve, but to understand and act on that understanding.[24] Service-learning programs with dedicated adult supervisors and committed administrators can match young people with appropriate service slots and monitor the quality of their actual experiences. Cursory exposure to service will

not satisfy the goals of service. Only programs that properly train and engage the participants and provide an atmosphere for serious reflection on the meaning and impact of the experience are ultimately worthwhile.[25] If it is to succeed in its noble goals, a service-learning program cannot exist without forceful public policy and careful attention to both purpose and details.

> ***Service is needed to allow us to have a future. . . .our society has needs which cannot be met except through service. Service is our ticket to a viable future. It is essential and not a luxury.***
>
> — Hans Huessy, College of Medicine, University of Vermont

Service: A Requirement for Everyone?

School-based voluntary service programs are gaining momentum. Slowly, but steadily, the main messages are taking hold. Local and state agencies are testing new structures and outreach methods, while communities, schools and colleges, local organizations, and governments are expanding service programs.[26] In 1986, two major national education associations, the Council of Chief State School Officers and the National Association of State Boards of Education, published comprehensive guidelines for state agencies wishing to undertake service programs. The CCSSO-NASBE guidelines, and several follow-up meetings to gain feedback on the implementation of service programs, demonstrate the growing interest and commitment of educational policymakers.

An expanding pattern of policy actions and program initiatives across the country, many strongly supported by governors such as Rudy Perpich (MN), George Deukmejian (CA), Richard Celeste (OH), Madeleine Kunin (VT), and Robert Casey (PA), provide examples such as these:

- Vermont requires all students to complete a research or citizenship project which many fulfill through service. SerVermont combines a "bottom-up" design in which student-faculty teams create service projects in their communities.
- The Governor's School in the State of Washington trains students from different socio-economic backgrounds to develop and lead service projects.
- In Atlanta, where service is considered part of an essential trio along with education and employment, students must complete 75 hours of unpaid service between grades 9 and 11, and seniors must take a course on "Duties to the Community." All students keep journals and a log of their after-school, weekend, and holiday service work.
- In Springfield, Massachusetts, under the active sponsorship of the mayor and the superintendent of schools, every student in grades K-12 is expected to perform community service integrated with the academic curriculum.
- About a quarter of the nation's independent schools require some form of service as part of the regular curriculum. Several public high schools in Minnesota require service. Banneker High School, a magnet academic school in Washington, DC, requires 270 hours and Metro High School in St. Louis 240 hours of service for graduation.
- Youth Community Service, a joint project of the Constitutional Rights Foundation and the Los Angeles Unified School District, is the largest program of all. Now in its fourth year, it operates in 22 Los Angeles high schools and involves over 5,000 students, largely minority, in service.[27]
- The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching recommended that a new Carnegie unit for service be included in the graduation requirements of all high schools.[28]

- The State of Maryland requires all high schools to offer service as an elective, while the Regents' Action Plan in New York calls for a required senior course in government participation that includes a practicum in school, community, or government service.

Several national efforts facilitate service. Youth Service America, acting as an information clearinghouse, reports on over 50 state and local full-time youth corps, nearly 500 campus-based service programs, and more than 3,000 school-based programs and offers technical assistance to start youth service programs. Youth Service America and the Campus Outreach Opportunity League sponsored "A Day in the Life of Service" on October 13, 1988 to call attention to the preponderance of the three streams of service activity in America: in schools, on campuses, and in youth corps. The National Society for Internships and Experiential Education houses a national information center on service and provides a national talent bank and technical and professional assistance to those institutions interested in service-learning projects. A guidebook, by Dan Conrad and Diane Hedin for the Independent Sector, provides yet another valuable tool for start-up and evaluation of service programs.[29]

Two organizations—Campus Compact: The Project for Public and Community Service, a project of the Education Commission of the States, and the Campus Outreach Opportunity League (COOL), a network of student-run service programs — involve college students and their institutions in service. Campus Compact encourages college students to become mentors for at-risk youth, while COOL provides a clearinghouse for 450 college student-run service programs.[30] At Washington University in St. Louis, where an estimated 25 percent of the students volunteer, the dean of students says that the engine driving volunteerism, now as always, is youthful idealism and that service allows students to transcend themselves and find meaning, fulfillment, and self-definition.

The Commission believes that more extensive involvement would produce the same result for more young people if the service ethic were an integral part of the educational system, beginning with kindergarten and the early grades. ***The Commission recommends creation of quality opportunities for service, as central to the fundamental educational program of every public school, including (a) either a requirement that each school provide opportunities to every student for a voluntary service-learning program built on good practices which is eligible for elective credit toward graduation, or a graduation requirement of a specified amount of service; and (b) age-appropriate curricula and instruction, including both service and class-based reflection, during each year from kindergarten through the twelfth grade.*** Service-learning programs can include provisions for coordination and supervision in te schools, meaningful service sites in communities, and recognition award ceremonies for those involved in service. The resolve and cooperation of school boards, administrators, coordinators, and teachers can ensure that service become a part of the regular academic program of all schools. Local, state, and national resources, secured from private and public sources, can make quality service opportunities a reality.

The Commission believes that decisions about how to structure community service must remain in the hands of schools and communities. We urge, however, that local programs pay careful attention to the criteria we have set out when they begin service programs, especially regarding genuine engagement (rather than mere exposure to service), time for reflection, and a clear mission statement backed up by committed personnel to administer and monitor service-learning programs. ***The Commission encourages states not merely to adopt youth service policies, but to provide local school boards and jurisdictions with financial and technical assistance to make them quality experiences for America's young people.***

The Case for Youth Volunteer Corps

In addition to school-based service-learning programs, youth corps membership offers a way for young adults to develop or continue the service habit. The Peace Corps, VISTA, and National Health Service Corps are the best-known national examples of such service. A growing number of voluntary youth corps in cities, counties, and states fuse the environmental and human service needs of communities with the equally important need for youth to serve. These full-time corps programs pay participants minimum wage for service, often offer educational opportunities, and perform beneficial community service.

Most state and local youth corps participants, dropouts and high school graduates alike, have traditionally been young people who need a second chance to make something of their lives. Increasingly, however, youth from all walks of life are

It's two degrees above zero at 8 am as the last of nine Chicago Youth Corps workers files into the Urban Programs West office on Chicago's West Side. The crew members are lucky today: they'll be working inside at the Garfield Park Conservatory. A couple of weeks ago they were working outside in these temperatures, mulching, wrapping, and pruning trees on a park district golf course.[31]

When David Russell of Manhattan's Upper West Side graduated from prep school and entered college, he wasn't thinking about helping others for a living. 'You go to high school, you try to get into the right college, you try to take the right major to get the best job to make a lot of money. It's all you, you, you. But I took a year off and learned about working with people.'[32]

deciding that youth corps offer valuable routes to experience that help them later in choosing work, training, service in the armed forces, or college. The Corps' main goal is preparation for life, including finding out what it means to be a caring and contributing member of the community. But they pursue other important goals as well: improving job readiness, learning to work with others, enhancing basic learning skills, and starting or continuing college study. For many, service means broadening perspectives about different racial or ethnic groups and thinking about college careers in human services. For all, "the corps programs aim to instill a sense of the value of work, a feeling of civic responsibility, and a sense of self-worth by doing environmental protection, physical development, and human service work that is clearly needed but would otherwise not be done."[33]

To meet goals of service and job readiness, several program components are key. Well-trained crew leaders, who have daily contact with corps members, are critical to corps' success. They are responsible for job supervision, individual and group counseling, and ongoing assessment and motivation.[34] Many corps offer opportunities for education—General Education Development Certificate (GED) preparation, instruction in English as a second language, or college courses. Corps in cities, counties, and states incorporate general goals in a variety of ways determined locally.

The number of youth corps is growing steadily. Currently, the 50 year-round or summer state and local corps operate with 50,000 participants annually and budgets totalling $145 million.[35] Several states have launched or expanded youth service corps, broadening them to urban areas and including human services as well as conservation work. The Congress is considering legislation to boost both conservation and human service corps.

A way of computing the value of youth corps service is to calculate the costs of the service if performed by an alternative supplier. For example, the Forest Service receives an estimate of $456,000 to complete a project; the local conservation corps performs the same service for $200,000. After computing the cost savings and the program costs (including minimum wage salaries for participants), one study by Public/Private Ventures of the California Conservation Corps estimates $1.34 in benefits for each $1 spent by the program. The estimate of the Human Environment Center of Washington, DC, a clearinghouse for youth corps programs, is higher: $1.60 in public benefit for each $1 spent by the Corps. This cost analysis includes only

immediate benefits—not the long-term value of the work performed, the human potential enhanced, or the social costs avoided.

Following a long tradition of service in American history—the Civilian Conservation Corps under Franklin Roosevelt, the Peace Corps under John Kennedy, VISTA under Lyndon Johnson, ACTION under Richard Nixon, Youth Conservation Corps under Jimmy Carter—the California Conservation Corps, started in 1976 under Governor Jerry Brown, became a permanent state agency in 1983 under Governor George Deukmejian. The CCC has had 36,000 participants, including 2,200 this year. Its current budget of $58 million provides more than three million hours of public service conservation work and emergency assistance to the state each year.

Other state corps operate in a variety of ways. The Wisconsin Corps has a two-year $4 million budget to support 65 predominantly rural projects and 750 participants. The Corps is 28 percent women, 19 percent minorities, and four percent persons with disabilities. In Maryland, the Department of Natural Resources coordinates and funds 24 county programs. The Washington State Service Corps focuses entirely on human service projects.

Cities, too, are active in the youth corps movement. San Francisco Conservation Corps (SFCC) graduates are sought-after employees because of the skills they have learned and the attitudes about work they have acquired. The Corps, which began its program with community development block grants, is partially funded by payments for the services it performs. For example, one work crew our Commission visited is learning advanced carpentry and construction skills by converting a cavernous former embarkation pier at Fort Mason into a community theater and cultural center. New corps programs, however, need start-up money before they can establish a reputation for service deserving of public and private contracts.

The Fairmont Park Urban Ranger Program, created by the William Penn Foundation of Philadelphia, combines service, employment training, and college studies. This new $13 million project serves 80 young people who have completed high school, but need additional training and job opportunities. At the end of four years, there will be 120 fully-trained Rangers who have also completed two years of course work at Temple University. The goal of the uniformed Rangers is to restore and maintain Fairmont Park as a place of beauty, safety, and civic pride.

The City Volunteer Corps of New York City (CVC), with an annual $8 million budget from the city, has pioneered volunteer efforts in human service delivery. Conscious of the need for broad economic and ethnic participation, CVC has also started a summer program for high school youth who work full-time in the summer and part-time during the school year. In Summer 1988, CVC instituted a small program for students already in college in the city, offering summer stipends and bonuses for one and two semesters of part-time Corps work while continuing college. The 600 CVC volunteers fan out daily across the city in their uniforms sporting the CVC Big Apple logo. Their projects are located in city parks, building rehabilitation, centers for retarded adults, nursing homes, and schools. Every three months the volunteers change projects so that participants have environmental, construction, and human service work experiences during a one-year period. CVC also offers completion incentives: $2,500 for those who complete one year of service or $5,000 toward college for those who choose to resume their studies.

The New York City model spawned Youth Volunteer Corps of Greater Kansas City in which 40 percent of the first 76 volunteers were minority group members. A recent urban corps effort, Boston's 'City Year' adds the feature of adult mentors from the civic and business community who are paired with youth corps participants. Organizer Michael Brown says, "We see youth service as a way to break down barriers. . . .This is citizenship at the broadest level."

Public/Private Ventures, a research and evaluation institute based in Philadelphia, studied nine representative corps programs across the nation and in Canada that have similar goals but different settings and approaches. P/PV found that:[36]

- The Corps produced a large volume of quality work of considerable value to the communities in which they operate.
- The traditional rural corps model of physical work has been successfully translated in the urban environment to human service work.
- Youth corps do not include diverse populations; most are fairly homogeneous, with populations that have major educational and economic needs.
- Corps are highly successful in promoting youth development through the work process and team involvement, but less successful in improving basic skills and educational attainment.

- Programs produce in-program benefits for all corpsmembers and significant post-program economic benefits for disadvantaged corps members.
- Non-economic benefits were mixed, depending on whether or not explicit mechanisms were in place to achieve them.
- A cost/benefit analysis of the California Conservation Corps shows that the combined value of its work and impact on post-program earnings very nearly equals the cost of running the corps and that this finding is likely to be true of other corps as well.

The most serious concerns of the P/PV assessment have to do with the important relationship between education and work. Youth corps programs, particularly newer ones, are seeking solutions by variously mandating that all youth participate in a formal educational component, offering individually-based competency remediation, or awarding cash scholarships for completion of the program. In addition, a lack of diversity in most corps populations means that stimulating interaction among participants from different backgrounds is often missing.[37]

One-third of SFCC volunteers drop out in the first month despite the lure of a $100 bonus for 60 days of perfect attendance. The attrition rate of New York City's CVC, 25 percent in 1988, decreased gradually over its five-year history as different approaches to retain Corps members were successful. Local situations demand local solutions. What works for some will not work for all. *The Commission strongly supports the youth corps concept and encourages—as elsewhere in this report—the use of diverse methods to achieve the same goals: that youth learn, work, participate, and contribute.* We suggest state and local planners consult the experience of existing programs before they design their own. Briefly stated, experienced corps leaders recommend that corps:

- promote the idea that communities need young people just as youth need community support;
- provide work and life skills and continuing education for corpsmembers;
- serve a public need by producing tangible products that have lasting value and economic benefit to their communities; and
- be environmentally sound.[38]

One novel way to finance these youth corps, which cost money despite the benefits they bring, is the California Bottle Bill. The legislation places a one cent surcharge on all beverage bottles sold in the state with a percentage of this revenue earmarked for the state's seven urban service corps. (Pending legislation would substantially increase both the tax and funding for service corps.)

The relationship of youth corps to community business and industry is clear. Chevron loaned a personnel specialist to the San Francisco Conservation Corps. An Oregon logging company retained the corps for after-cut environmental restoration. A New Jersey Corps branch is starting a small business with help from the private sector. Each Boston 'City Year' service team is financed by a Boston area corporation. Conservationists, the elderly, and community safety organizers—interests and constituencies served by youth—need to be enlisted to support other youth corps activities.

Based on the positive results of programs from around the country, ***the Commission encourages communities to expand youth corps programs and to combine support from business, local foundations, city and state resources, and grants from organizations that are natural allies of the youth corps movement to begin or extend youth corps programs.***

We also recommend that the many existing organizations interested in expanding the practice of youth service unite in one nationwide service federation. In such unity lies additional influence and greater fundraising ability, which can speed the day when youth service programs are available throughout the land.

Toward National Service?

The issue of national service has been simmering on the back burner for some time. The US Congress is considering several efforts to encourage local and state youth service programs. H.R. 18, the proposed Youth Service Corps Act, for example, would establish: (1) an American Conservation Service to improve, restore, maintain, and conserve public lands and resources, and (2) a National Youth Service to encourage young persons to participate in voluntary human service projects.[41] The programs would be open to young people age 16 to 25 throughout the year and age 15-21 during the summer. The proposed legislation would:

- encourage states and localities to launch their own youth corps activities;

- provide matching funds for start-up and planning of youth corps; and
- offer technical assistance to start-up projects to train successful planners and workers.

In addition, the Act calls for the creation of a 32-member Commission on Service Opportunities to examine major issues associated with national service.

A 1988 report of the Democratic Leadership Council added another ingredient to the debate over national service. It proposes voluntary national service with accompanying incentives to persuade many high school graduates, from all economic strata, to choose one or two years of service. The plan would replace existing financial aid grants and loans with vouchers available to youth who complete national service in one

> *National service should be open to all but required of none; it should develop gradually; it should be as decentralized as possible but with federal government underwriting; . . . participants would both serve and learn. . .*[39]

> *For many years we talked about a national service program at the federal level, but we forgot to remember that a national program is not the same thing as a federal program. In the last three or four years, it has been most gratifying to see what's happening at the grass roots level. We really have a national program, but it's happening where it ought to happen—at the state level, at the city level, at the community level, and not adding just another federal program.*[40]

The Commission on Youth and America's Future warmly supports legislation that would provide federal funding to launch youth service programs provided that states and communities would retain wide latitude in the design of programs that meet local needs and preferences. We also support a revitalization of such important national service corps as the Peace Corps and VISTA. Serious consideration should be given to proposals for a National Youth Conservation Corps to work primarily in our national parks, wilderness areas, and national forests.

In 1986, the Coalition for a Democratic Majority proposed voluntary national service that would establish a civilian service component and make federal aid to college students contingent on their "performance of civic duties—either military or civilian."[42] of three ways: citizen corps (1-2 years), citizen soldiers (2 years), or career military (4 year minimum). Paralleling a new GI Bill, the proposal offers benefits to the individual and society, a stimulus for more young people to attend college, and long-term financial benefits to the nation in tax revenues and service performed.[43]

The Commission does not endorse a model that ties all education aid to student service. Such legislation would require the poor to serve as a condition of obtaining postsecondary education, while allowing the wealthy to study without assuming any comparable civic obligation. Nevertheless, we recognize this proposal as a possible platform from which to initiate serious discussion about how to combine the three attributes our young people strive for: (1) a sound educational background in high

school and postsecondary skills training or college, (2) an economic base from which to build healthy family life, which includes affordable housing and health care, and (3) an opportunity and an obligation to serve and to practice the responsibilities of citizenship. A comprehensive debate over national service is beyond the scope of this Commission, but we support all responsible efforts to bring such a discussion to the forefront.

Service is the most concrete way to inculcate the ideal of reciprocity and civic responsibility that is at the heart of this nation's democratic traditions. It is in giving that one receives, as it is in loving that one is loved.[44] The Commission believes that youth will be better learners, workers, and citizens if they practice serving others early and regularly in their lives.

PATHWAYS TO SUCCESS:

Recommendations

At the core of citizenship is the willingness to contribute to the common good. When young people are asked to channel their idealism and energy into helping others and solving community problems, they build respect for themselves and attachments to others. Therefore, we recommend:

- **Creation of quality student service opportunities as central to the fundamental educational program of every public school including (a) *either* a requirement that each school provide opportunities to every student for a voluntary service-learning program eligible for elective credit toward graduation, *or* a graduation *requirement* of a specified amount of service; and (b) age-appropriate curricula and instruction... including both service and class-based reflection, during each year from kindergarten through twelfth grade. (p. 88)**
- **State-level encouragement of local school jurisdiction efforts to enlist the young in serving their communities, including the provision of sufficient financial and technical assistance to ensure high quality programs. (p. 88)**
- **Financial support from business, local foundations, city and state resources, and grants from organizations whose constituencies are served by youth—the elderly, neighborhood organizations, and conservationists—to ensure that the maturing effects of service to others will be available to all youth; and the use of diverse methods to achieve the goals that youth learn, work, participate, and contribute. (pp. 88)**
- **Unification of the many existing organizations interested in expanding youth service into one nationwide service federation. (p. 88)**
- **Support for federal financial assistance to launch youth service programs as proposed in several Congressional bills currently under consideration, provided that states and communities retain wide latitude in the design of programs that meet local needs. (p. 89)**
- **Revitalization of existing national service programs such as VISTA and the Peace Corps, and serious consideration to proposals for a National Youth Conservation Corps to work primarily in national parks, wilderness areas, and national forests. (p. 89)**

Copies of the full 208 page report in which this chapter appears, *The Forgotten Half: Pathways to Success for America's Youth and Young Families*, may be ordered for a publication and shipping cost of $5.00 each. Write: *Youth and America's Future*, Suite 301, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20036-5541.

Publications of

YOUTH AND AMERICA'S FUTURE:

THE WILLIAM T. GRANT FOUNDATION COMMISSION ON WORK, FAMILY AND CITIZENSHIP

The Grant Commission issued its Interim Report, **The Forgotten Half: Non-College Youth in America,** on January 20, 1988. The Commission's Final Report is **The Forgotten Half: Pathways to Success for America's Youth and Young Families,** issued on November 17, 1988. Each is available from the Commission for the publication and handling charge of *$5.00 each*.

Publications of the Commission are not *copyrighted* and their *reproduction is encouraged*. When quoting or reproducing Commission publications, please note the source as: **"Youth and America's Future: The William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship."**

* * *

American Youth: A Statistical Snapshot *by James Wetzel*

Drawing on the latest statistically reliable government surveys, this demographic review captures much of the diversity inherent in a collective portrait of American 15–24 year-olds. Includes data on marriage, childbearing, living arrangements, income, education, employment, health, and juvenile justice. Historical trends as well as future projections are presented along with *12 charts, 18 tables*.

Current Federal Policies and Programs for Youth *by J.R. Reingold and Associates*

Who is doing what for youth in the federal government? This concise survey of current federal policies and programs for youth in Education, Health and Human Services, Labor, Justice, and Defense provides a one-of-a-kind resource for researchers, practitioners, analysts, and policymakers who want quick access to accurate information about federal youth policy. *Includes state-level allocation tables.*

Youth Policies and Practices in Selected Countries *by Rosemary George*

Presents the salient features of the post-compulsory education and training policies of 11 foreign countries designed to smooth the transition of non-college-bound youth into the workplace. The countries are: Australia, Britain, Canada, Finland, France, West Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Japan, Norway, and Sweden. *Includes tables.*

Facts and Faith: A Status Report on Youth Service *by Anne C. Lewis.* **Commentary** *by Jane Kendall*

Clarifies the underlying assumptions and reviews the current state of knowledge about youth service programs, including barriers and supports for such programs. The overriding challenge of youth service is to combine the dual needs that youth have: to work and to serve. Citing dozens of local, state, and national youth service programs, this analysis is a vital resource for policymakers and community leaders. Commentary stresses the value of service-learning.

- Copies of these four **Information Papers** are available for *$5.00 each postpaid* from: **William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Youth and America's Future,** Suite 301, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036-5541.

- The following **Working Papers** were prepared for the Commission's deliberations by a variety of scholars and practitioners. They are available from the Commission at *$10.00 each postpaid*.

Youth Transition from Adolescence to the World of Work *by Garth L. Mangum.* **Commentaries** *by Marvin Lazerson and Stephen F. Hamilton.*

Summarizes labor market realities, employer expectations, parental influences, and the difficulties youth experience as they move into the world of work. Highlights vocational education, apprenticeship, and on-the-job training opportunities available for youth. Makes recommendations for how families, schools, and workplaces can aid youth in the transition to work.

Youth and the Workplace: Second-Chance Programs and the Hard-to-Serve *by Thomas J. Smith, Gary C. Walker, Rachel A. Baker, (Public/Private Ventures).* **Commentaries** *by Gary Burtless, Jacqueline P. Danzberger, Morton H. Sklar, Richard F. Elmore.*

Second-chance education, training, and employment programs of the last decade are detailed. Includes tables and an appendix of model programs for at-risk youth. Four commentaries expand the research and policy recommendations.

Vanishing Dreams: The Growing Economic Plight of America's Young Families *by Clifford M. Johnson, Andrew M. Sum, and James D. Weill.* (Published by Children's Defense Fund with partial assistance from Youth and America's Future.)

Publications of Youth and America's Future

Who Will Train and Educate Tomorrow's Workers? The Financing of Non-College-Bound Young Workers' Recurrent Education *by Robert Sheets, Andrew Hahn, Robert Lerman and Erik Butler.*

Advocates the need for universal recurrent education and discusses practical ways of achieving expanded post-secondary opportunities for non-college youth, the major losers in today's labor market. Describes public, private, and cooperative strategies that can begin to close the gap between education and work.

Youth and Work: What We Know, What We Don't Know, What We Need to Know *by Ivan Charner and Bryna Shore Fraser (National Institute for Work and Learning).* **Commentaries** *by Sue E. Berryman and Hayes Mizell.*

A comprehensive analysis of research on the educational, occupational, and personal benefits youth accrue through work. Examines work patterns of demographic subgroups, roles and responsibilities of youth workers, reasons for and attitudes toward participation in work, and actual work experiences.

The Bridge: Cooperative Education for All High School Students *by Cynthia Parsons.* **Commentaries** *by Dennis Gray and David Lynn, Morgan V. Lewis, Roy L. Wooldridge.*

Calling for a fundamental change in American high schools, the founder of a successful Vermont community service program presents a rationale and methodology for experiential and cooperative education models. Underscores the benefits of combining learning and doing in a school-based, supervised setting.

What Does the Independent Sector Do for 16–24 Year-Olds? *by Miriam M. Wood.* **Commentaries** *by Virginia Hodgkinson and Leonard W. Stern.*

Identifies, quantifies, and analyzes the role of independent sector agencies and organizations serving 16–24 year-olds. Interprets factors, including funding and organizational barriers, that affect the vitality of human service agencies.

The Interaction of Family, Community, and Work in the Socialization of Youth *by Stephen F. Hamilton.* **Commentaries** *by John Ogbu and Paul Riesman.*

Explores the critical connections among family, community, and the workplace as they interact with young people. Calls for establishing intentional policy among these three spheres of influence to bolster their separate, but interconnected roles in socializing youth.

The Difference that Differences Make: Adolescent Diversity and Its Deregulation *by Melvin D. Levine, M.D.* **Commentaries** *by Michael S. Wald and John H. Martin.*

Discusses how teaching methods and expectations can constrict the ways in which young people learn, denying many access to education and employment opportunities. Contends that predetermined memory, verbal, and written criteria—to which a large number of students cannot and do not respond well—are often the only vehicles for showing knowledge. Argues for a wider lens through which to view young people and their abilities.

Transitional Difficulties of Out-of-Home Youth *by Joy Duva and Gordon Raley.* **Commentaries** *by Eileen M. Pasztor and Peter R. Correia III and Anita Fream.*

A targeted look at a vulnerable part of the youth population—foster care youth and runaways—who they are, how many they are, what programs serve them, what special problems they encounter in their transition to adulthood, what more needs to be done. Examines independent living programs that assist older out-of-home youth in preparing for life and work.

The Transition to Adulthood of Youth with Disabilities *by David Vandergoot, Amy Gottlieb, and Edwin W. Martin.* **Commentaries** *by Sharon Stewart Johnson and Diane Lipton and Mary Lou Breslin.*

Cites youth with disabilities as an economically disadvantaged subgroup and explores family support, education, and employment issues as well as the barriers to community participation and self-sufficiency particular to these youth. Includes extensive research findings and policy recommendations.

Mutuality in Parent-Adolescent Relationships *by James Youniss.* **Commentaries** *by Ann C. Crouter and John H. Lewko.*

Through a comprehensive review of recent research, counters popular mythology that adolescent relationships with parents and peers are negative. Provides a context for adolescent-parent and adolescent-peer relationships to guide program development and policy considerations.

Communities and Adolescents: An Exploration of Reciprocal Supports *by Joan Wynn, Harold Richman, Robert A. Rubenstein, and Julia Littell, with Brian Britt and Carol Yoken.* **Commentaries** *by Diane F. Hedin and Judith B. Erickson.*

What can communities do to be more responsive to youth and what can communities expect from youth? Explores the rich variety of community supports that can be made available to adolescents if individual communities decide to make youth a priority. Appendix includes 22 selected studies describing the differing impacts of community supports on adolescents.

Determinants of Youth's Successful Entry into Adulthood *by Sarah Gideonse.* **Commentaries** *by Elijah Anderson and David F. Ricks.*

What prevents youth from successful entry into adulthood: individual defects or environment flaws? Addresses the factors which account for the difficulties youth have in assuming adult roles. Examines characteristics and circumstances that promote positive changes in young people and explains why it is never too late for interventions—even for youth with multiple problems.

Family Influences on Transitions to the Adult Job Market *by Robert I. Lerman and Theodora Ooms.* **Commentaries** *by Frank F. Furstenberg, Jr. and Margaret Simms.*

Analyzes the often ignored interrelationship of family influences and youth employment decisions. Emphasizes the critical connections among youth's living arrangements, the responsibilities of young people, and their choices about work.

Barriers to Developing Comprehensive and Effective Youth Services *by William Treanor.* **Commentaries** *by David Richart and Dorothy Stoneman.*

A provocative discussion of the youth service world: prevailing attitudes toward youth, history, funding dilemmas, and leadership and staffing scenarios. Recommends a prototype for youth service systems.